UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/369,114	08/05/1999	JASON A. KRONZ	249768038US	6368

25096 7590 09/17/2003

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER	
JOHNSON, MARLON B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	14

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/369,114	KRONZ, JASON A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marlon Johnson	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 August 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *36 and 38-42* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35 and 37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mendez et al. (5,961,590).

In considering claim 31,

Mendez et al. discloses a method for a first consumer device to access services of a remote second device, comprising the steps of:

establishing a link between the first consumer device and the remote second device that allows the first consumer device to access services from the remote second device, by

establishing a first communicative connection between the first consumer device and a first server that is local to the first consumer device (see Fig. 1, Desktop Computer 134, LAN Firewall 114; col. 3, lines 40-48);

establishing a second communicative connection between the first server and a second server that is remote from the first server and local to the second device (see Fig. 1, LAN Firewall 114, Global Firewall 112; col. 3, lines 40-48; col. 9, lines 1-8); and

establishing a third communicative connection between the second server and the second device (see Fig. 1, Global Firewall 112, Remote Server 102),

wherein the established link includes the first, second and third communicative connections and wherein communications from the first consumer device to the remote second device are forwarded along the link by the first and second servers in a manner transparent to the first consumer device (via Synchronization Agent), the forwarding in the transparent manner such that the first consumer device and the second device appear to each other to be local (see col. 9, lines 8-23) [note: the firewalls are hiding all the addressing details from the desktop computer and the global server];

requesting a service that is available from the second device, the requesting by the first consumer device and utilizing the established link (via Global Server) (see col. 5, lines 48-52); and

performing the requested service at the second device (via Global Server) (see col. 5, lines 48-52).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 16, 18, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. (5,961,590), and in further view of Srbljic et al. (5,933,849). In considering claim 1,

Mendez et al. discloses a method for enabling a first consumer device that is able to communicate only with local devices to access services of a remote second device, comprising the steps of:

enabling establishment a link between the first consumer device and the remote second device via multiple intermediate servers (firewalls), by

establishing a first communicative connection between the first consumer device and a first intermediate server that is local to the first consumer device (see Fig. 1, Desktop Computer 134, LAN Firewall 114; col. 3, lines 40-48); and

establishing a second communicative connection between the first intermediate server and a second intermediate server that is remote from the first server and that is local to the second device (see Fig. 1, LAN Firewall 114, Global Firewall 112; col. 3, lines 40-48; col. 9, lines 1-8); and

establishing a third communicative connection between the second intermediate server and the second device (see Fig. 1, Global Firewall 112, Remote Server 102),

and wherein the established link includes the first, second, and third

communicative connections, and wherein communications from the first consumer device to the remote second device are forwarded along the link by the first and second servers in a manner transparent to the first consumer device (via Synchronization Agent) (see col. 9, lines 8-23);

requesting a service that is available from the second device, the requesting by the first consumer device and utilizing the established link (via Global Server) (see col. 5, lines 48-52); and

performing the requested service at the second device (via Global Server) (see col. 5, lines 48-52).

Although Mendez et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose, under control of the first consumer device, requesting from the first intermediate server a listing of services available via the first intermediate server; receiving from the first intermediate server a listing of multiple available services; and after receiving the listing of multiple available services, requesting from the first intermediate server one of the multiple available services, available to be provided by the remote second device. However, Srbljic et al., whose invention is a scalable distributed caching system on a network, discloses such requesting from the first intermediate server (receiving cache) a listing of services available via the first intermediate server (object request); receiving from the first intermediate server a listing of multiple available services (directory list from a directory cache); and after receiving the listing of multiple available services, requesting from the first intermediate server one of the multiple available services, available to be provided by the remote second device (directory cache) (see col. 4, lines 35-67). Therefore, given the teachings of Srbljic et al., it would have been obvious

for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Mendez et al. by requesting from the first intermediate server a listing of services available via the first intermediate server; receiving from the first intermediate server a listing of multiple available services; and after receiving the listing of multiple available services, requesting from the first intermediate server one of the multiple available services, available to be provided by the remote second device in order to transparently provide a service request to a client from a secondary resource as opposed to redirecting the client to the secondary resource, thus reduce network consumption.

In considering claim 2,

Mendez et al. disloses a method wherein the step of establishing the second communicative connection further comprises the step of verifying that the first device has authorization to establish the second communicative connection (see Fig. 1, LAN Firewall 114) [note: a firewall inherently verifies authorization for a device to have access to an outside communication device].

In considering claim 6,

Mendez et al. discloses a method wherein the establishing of the third communicative connection comprises the step of establishing a wireless communicative connection between the second device and the second server (see col. 4, lines 36-44).

In considering claim 7,

Mendez et al. discloses an apparatus for accessing services of a remote device via one or more intermediate servers, comprising:

a first module capable of initiating establishment of a first communicative connection to a local intermediate server and, of initiating establishment of at least a

second communicative connection between the local intermediate server and the remote device (see Fig. 1, Synchronization Agent 124; col. 3, lines 40-48; col. 9, lines 8-23; col. 5, lines 48-52);

Additionally,

Srbljic et al. discloses:

a second module capable of receiving from the local intermediate server a listing of multiple services available via the local intermediate server and of requesting from the local intermediate sever one of the multiple available services, the requested service available to be performed from the remote device so that the remote device will perform the requested service after receiving notification of the request (see col. 4, lines 35-67).

In considering claim 16,

Mendez et al. discloses a system for allowing client devices remote from each other to communicate via intermediate server devices, the system comprising:

a local server able to communicatively couple to a client device that is local to the local server, the local client device designed to communicate only with other local client devices, the local server also able to communicatively couple to a remote server (see Fig. 1; LAN Firewall 114), the local server operative to:

receive a request from the local client device for an indicated service to be performed (see col. 7, lines 63-67);

provide a request message to the remote server to perform the indicated service (see col. 7, lines 63-67);

receive a response message from the remote server, the response message

being affiliated with the request message (see col. 7, lines 53-63); and

respond to the local client device with information indicative of the response message (see col. 7, lines 53-63); and

the remote server able to communicatively couple to the local server and to a remote client device that is local to the remote server (see Fig. 1, LAN Firewall 114, Global Firewall 112), the remote server operative to:

receive the request message from the local server (see col. 7, lines 63-67);

perform further processing based on the request message (see col. 7, lines 53-67); and

provide the response message to the local server, so that the local client device can request services that are provided by the remote client device by using the local and remote servers as intermediaries (see col. 7, lines 53-67).

In considering claim 18,

Mendez et al. discloses a system wherein the request from the local device comprises a request to establish a logical connection between the local device and the remote server (see col. 7, lines 63-67).

In considering claim 32,

Mendez et al. discloses a method for a first consumer device to access services of a remote second device, comprising the steps of:

establishing a link between the first consumer device and the remote second

device that allows the first consumer device to access services from the remote second device, by

establishing a first communicative connection between the first consumer device and a first server that is local to the first consumer device (see Fig. 1, Desktop Computer 134, LAN Firewall 114; col. 3, lines 40-48);

establishing a second communicative connection between the first server and a second server that is remote from the first server and local to the second device (see Fig. 1, LAN Firewall 114, Global Firewall 112; col. 3, lines 40-48; col. 9, lines 1-8); and

establishing a third communicative connection between the second server and the second device (see Fig. 1, Global Firewall 112, Remote Server 102),

wherein the established link includes the first, second and third communicative connections and wherein communications from the first consumer device to the remote second device are forwarded along the link by the first and second servers in a manner transparent to the first consumer device (via Synchronization Agent) (see col. 9, lines 8-23);

requesting a service that is available from the second device, the requesting by the first consumer device and utilizing the established link (via Global Server) (see col. 5, lines 48-52); and

performing the requested service at the second device (via Global Server) (see col. 5, lines 48-52).

Additionally,

Srbljic et al. discloses:

the forwarding in the transparent manner including the first server device representing the second device in communications with the first consumer devices over the first and including the second server device representing the first device in communications with the second device over the second communication connection (see col. 4, lines 35-67).

5. Claims 3, 8, 33, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. and Srbljic et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bezair et al. (5,758,088).

In considering claim 3,

Although Mendez et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose a method further comprising the step of sending from the second device to the first device the status of the performing step. However, Bezaire et al., whose invention is a system in which electronic communications is sent from a workstation to a wireless device over an information service WAN, discloses such a status being sent from the second device (via Wireless Service Provider 22) to a first device (via Wireless Gateway Server 18) (see col. 5, lines 13-22). Therefore, given the teachings of Bezaire et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Mendez et al. by sending from the second device to the first device the status of the performing step in order to let the first device know why or why not the service is available.

In considering claim 8,

Mendez et al. discloses a server device that is capable of communicating over a first communications link with a client device and over a second network link with a second server

device, comprising:

a communications link interface for communicating between the server device and the client device;

a network interface for communicating between the server device and a second server device; and

a processing unit, being operable to send and receive data over the communications link interface and over the network interface [note: a communications link interface, network interface, an processing unit are all inherently needed in order to provide communication between the first and second device], the processing unit being further operable to:

establish a communications link for data communication through the link interface with the client device (see col. 3, lines 40-48; col. 9, lines 1-8);

establish a network link for data communication through the network interface to the second server device (see col. 3, lines 40-48; col. 9, lines 1-8);

Furthermore,

Bezaire et al. discloses a server device (Wireless Gateway Server 18) that is capable of communicating over a first communications link (Information Service WAN) with a client device (Workstation 12) and over a second network link (Wireless Service Provider 22) with a second server device (Wireless Device 24), comprising:

provide information to the client device about available services by,

obtaining information from the second server device about services available via the second server device (see col. 4, lines 20-39; col. 5, lines 13-22);

and

sending to the client device information about available services that includes the obtained information from the second server device (see col. 4, lines 20-39; col. 5, lines 13-22); and

facilitate performance of services for the client device by,

forwarding service requests from the client device to the second server device for one or more of the available services whose information was obtained from the second server device and sent to the client device (see col. 4, lines 20-39; col. 5, lines 13-22); and

forwarding responses to at least some of the service requests from the second server device to the client device (see col. 4, lines 20-39; col. 5, lines 13-22).

In considering claim 31,

Bezaire et al. discloses a method wherein the forwarding of communications between the first consumer device and the second device along the established link in a transparent manner is such that the first consumer device and the second device appear to each other to be local (see col. 2, lines 61-63; col.3, lines 26-42).

In considering claim 33,

Mendez et al. discloses a server device wherein the forwarding of the service request responses to the client device is performed in such a manner as to appear to the client device that the server device performed the requested services (see col. 11, lines 41-56).

In considering claim 37,

Bezaire et al. discloses a server device wherein the client device is able to perform services for other devices, and wherein the processing unit is further operable to:

obtain information from the client device about the services that the client device is able to perform (see col. 4, lines 49-59);

send to the second server device the obtained information from the client device (see col. 4, lines 49-59); and

facilitate performance of services for the second server device by the client device by forwarding service requests received from the second server device to the client device (see col. 4, lines 49-67 and col. 5, lines 1-8; col. 5, lines 13-22).

6. Claims 5, 17, 26-28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Rossmann (6,430,409).

In considering claim 4,

Although Mendez et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose a method further comprising the step of reporting to the first device a listing of services available from the second device. However, Rossmann, whose invention is a two-way data communications device that communicates with a server computer over a two-way data communication network, discloses such a reporting to the first device a listing of services available from the second device (see Fig. 2B, Menu 201; col. 12, lines 47-55). Therefore, given the teachings of Rossmann, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Mendez et al. by reporting to the first device a listing of services available from the second device in order to find out what services are available for use.

In considering claim 5,

Rossmann discloses a method wherein the establishing of the first communicative connection comprises the step of establishing a wireless communicative connection between the first consumer device and the first server (see Fig. 1, Data Capable Cellular Telephone Network 110).

In considering claims 17 and 18,

Rossmann discloses a system wherein the request from the local device comprises a request to establish a logical connection between the local device and the remote server, and includes an IP network address of the remote server (see Fig 8A, Steps 803 and 860; Fig. 1, Cellular Phone 100, Internet 140, Computer 141) (note: all messages/service requests sent from the local device to the remote server must inherently include an IP address of the computer server 141 in order for it to be correctly identified through internet 140).

In considering claim 20,

Rossmann discloses a system wherein after establishing a link with the remote server, the local server receives a message from the remote server indicating that the remote server is communicatively compatible with the local device (via the TIL) (see col. 43, lines 51-63; Fig. 7, TIL Decks 760).

In considering claims 26 and 27,

Rossmann discloses a system wherein the request from the local device comprises a request to disconnect a logical connection to the remote server, and the local server is operative to provide the request message to the remote server by:

transmitting to the remote server, a request to disconnect the logical connection between the local device and the remote server (see Fig. 13, "Connection Terminated") (note: a client operating with TCP inherently transmits a disconnect request to a server by turning on the FIN flag); and

wherein the receiving of the response message from the remote server includes receiving a status indicator from the remote server indicating that the logical connection is disconnected (see Fig. 13, "Connection Terminated") (note: a client operating with TCP inherently receives a disconnect status indicator from a server, in the form of an ACK – acknowledgement, when the servers receives the FIN from the client).

In considering claim 28,

Rossmann discloses a system wherein the request from the local device comprises a request for the remote device to provide a service (see col. 8, lines 1-5; col. 10, lines 3-9).

In considering claim 30,

Rossmann discloses a system wherein the request from the local device comprises a. request for the remote device to provide a service and wherein the performing of the further processing includes requesting the remote device to perform the service identified in the service request and the request message (see col. 8, lines 1-5; col. 10, lines 3-9; col. 10, lines 28-39).

7. Claims 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Bui et al. (6,412,007).

In considering claim 19,

Although Mendez et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to specifically disclose a method in which the user identification and password are sent to the remote server. However, Bui et al., whose invention is a mechanism for authorizing a data communication session between a client and a server, discloses the establishing of a link with the remote server (see Fig 5A, 502), as well as the transmittal of user identification and password to a remote server (see col. 1, lines 39-44; col. 14, lines 42-53). Therefore, given the teachings of Bui et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Mendez et al. by transmitting user identification to the remote server in order to provide remote authorization to access the second device, in addition to the local authorization.

Furthermore,

Bui et al. discloses a system wherein the request from the local device further includes a user identification and a password, and the providing of the request message to the remote server and the receiving of the response message from the remote server includes:

receiving a first status indicator from the remote server in response to the user identification (see Fig. 5C, Steps 530 and 540); and

receiving a second status indicator from the remote server in response to the password (see Fig. 5C, Steps 530 and 534) (note: the user identification and password are responded to at the same time).

In considering claim 21,

Bui et al. discloses a system wherein the first status indicator indicates that the user identification is not accepted by the remote server (see Fig. 5C, Step 530).

In considering claim 22,

Bui et al. discloses a system wherein the first status indicator indicates that the user identification is accepted by the remote server (see Fig. 5C, Step 534).

In considering claim 23,

Bui et al. discloses a system wherein the second status indicator indicates that the password provided is valid for the user identification (see Fig. 5C, Step 534) (note: as discussed above, the user identification and password are responded to at the same time by the same status indicator).

In considering claim 24,

Bui et al. discloses a system wherein the second status indicator indicates that the password provided is invalid for the user identification (see Fig. 5C, Step 530).

In considering claim 25,

Bui et al. discloses a system wherein the local server is operative to respond to the local device with information indicative of the response message by being further operative to:

provide a first response if the response message indicates that the logical connection could not be established (see Fig. 5C, Step 530);

provide a second response if the response message indicates that the user identification and password are not both acceptable by the remote server (see Fig. 5C, Step 530; col. 7, lines 42-53);

provide a third response if the response message indicates that the logical connection is established (see Fig. 5C, Step 534); and

provide a fourth response if the response message indicates that a logical connection already exists with another server (see Fig. 5A, Step 506; Fig. 5B, Step 515).

8. Claims 10, 11, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al., and further in view of Rossmann and Bui et al.

In considering claim 10,

Mendez et al. discloses a method for a first client device to access the services supplied by a second client device, comprising the steps of:

establishing a first link between the first client device and a first server (see Fig. 1, Desktop Computer 134, LAN Firewall 114; col. 3, lines 40-48);

Additionally, Bui et al. discloses a method for a first client device to access the services supplied by a second client device, comprising the step of:

transmitting a connection command over the first link to the first server, the connection command being operative to request a connection with a second server (Fig. 1B, Network 114, DSCs 108, 110, and 112) and comprises an address of the second server, a user identification, and a password (see col. 1, lines 39-44; col. 14, lines 42-53);

establishing a second link between the first server and a second server (see Fig. 1B, Network 114, DSCs 108, 110, and 112; col. 8, lines 14-15);

transmitting the connection command over the second link from the first server to the second server (see col. 7, lines 54-56);

verifying the authorization of the user identification and password at the second server (see col. 8, lines 60-65);

notifying the first server over the second link from the second server of the acceptance of the connection command upon success of the verifying step (see Fig. 5C, Steps 528 and 532);

notifying the first client device from the first server over the first link of the acceptance of the connection command (note: if the server is notified of the acceptance, the client must also inherently be notified of the acceptance);

Furthermore, Rossmann discloses a method for a first client device to access the services supplied by a second client device, comprising the step of:

requesting a listing from the first server of available services from the second client device wherein the first server requests such a listing from the second server, the second server maintaining such a listing from the second client device which is communicatively coupled to the second server over a third link, and the listing identifying at least one service offered by the second client device (see Fig. 2B, Menu 201; col. 12, lines 47-55);

the first consumer device requesting a service from the listing to be performed by the second client device by relaying a service request to the second client device (see Fig. 2B, Menu 201; col. 12, lines 47-55);

performing the service requested in the service request by the second client device (see Fig. 2B, Menu 201; col. 12, lines 47-55).

In considering claim 11,

Mendez et al. discloses a first client apparatus for accessing services supplied by a remote second apparatus, comprising:

means for initiating establishment of a first link between the first apparatus and a local first server (see Fig. 1, Desktop Computer 134, LAN Firewall 114; col. 3, lines 40-48);

means for transmitting a connection command over the first link to the local first server, the connection command being operative to request a connection with a remote second server and comprising a user identification, and a password (see Fig. 1, Desktop Computer 134, LAN Firewall 114; col. 3, lines 40-48) [note: user identification and a password are required in order to gain access across a firewall];

Additionally, Bui et al. discloses a first client apparatus for accessing services supplied by a second apparatus, comprising:

means for receiving notification from the local first server over the first link of acceptance of the connection command by the remote second server, the receiving of the acceptance notification after a second link is established between the local first server and the remote second server, , and after the remote second server verifies authorization of the user identification and password (see col. 7, lines 54-56; col. 8, lines 60-65; Fig. 5C, Steps 528 and 532) [note: if the server is notified of the acceptance, the client must also be notified of the acceptance];

Furthermore, Rossmann discloses a first client apparatus for accessing services supplied by a second apparatus, comprising:

means for requesting a listing from the local first server of one or more services available from the remote second apparatus, based at least in part on a listing maintained by the second server information obtained from the remote second apparatus over a third link communicatively coupling the remote second server to the remote second apparatus (see Fig. 2B, Menu 201; col. 12, lines 47-55);

means for requesting a service from the listing to be performed by the

second apparatus by relaying a service request to the second apparatus via the first server, such that the requested service will be performed by the second apparatus [note: in order for the first apparatus to obtain the services of the second apparatus, the first server must both receive the request from, and relay the request to the first apparatus].

Furthermore,

Srbljic et al. discloses:

Means for receiving from the local first server the requested listing after the local first server obtains that listing from the remote second server (see col. 4, lines 35-67).

In considering claim 20,

Rossmann discloses a system wherein after establishing a link with the remote server, the local server receives a message from the remote server indicating that the remote server is communicatively compatible with the local device (via the TIL) (see col. 43, lines 51-63; Fig. 7, TIL Decks 760).

9. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Craddock et al. (6,351,771).

Although Rossmann shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose a system wherein the service request message from the local device comprises a request for the remote server to identify a device type and a service type for at least one remote device that can be communicatively coupled to the remote server. However, Craddock et al., whose invention is a distributed service network system capable of transparently converting data formats and selectively connecting to an appropriate bridge in accordance with clients characteristics, discloses such a message comprising a request to identify a device type and

service type for at least one device (see col. 4, lines 49-54; col.5, lines 21-23). Therefore, given the teachings of Craddock et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rossmann by including a request for the remote server to identify a device type and a service type for at least one remote device in order for the local server to configure the transactions of the local client to be appropriate for the remote device (e.g. memory space of the remote device).

10. Claims 9 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. and Bezaire et al. as applied to claims 8 and 16 above, and further in view of Rossman.

In considering claim 9,

Rossmann discloses a server device wherein the communications link is a wireless interface (see Fig. 7, UDP Interfaces 714 and 748).

In considering claim 34,

Rossmann discloses the server device wherein the information sent to the client device includes information about services available from the server device, and wherein the processing unit is further operable to perform service requests received from the client device for one or more of the services available from the server device and generate responses to the client device for at least some of those service requests (see Fig. 2B, Menu 201; col. 12, lines 47-55).

11. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez et al. and Bezaire et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Page et al. (5,329,619).

In considering claim 35,

Although Mendez et al. and Bezaire et al. show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to disclose a device wherein the second server device is in communication

with a third server device that provides the available services whose information was obtained from the second server device, and wherein the service requests forwarded to the second server device for the available services cause the requested available services to be provided by the third server device. However, Page et al., whose invention is a system that supports a three-way communication path between a client, broker, and server, discloses such a second server device is in communication with a third server device that provides the available services whose information was obtained from the second server device, and wherein the service requests forwarded to the second server device for the available services cause the requested available services to be provided by the third server device (see col. 4, lines 22-41; Fig. 2, Server 12, Service Broker 14; col. 52, lines 13-42; Fig. 16A, Broker, Server). Therefore, given the teachings of Page et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Mendez et al. by providing the second server device for communicating with a third server device that provides the available services whose information was obtained from the second server device in order to let the first device know why or why not the service is available provide an additional server for handling requests that the second server is incapable of handling.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 36 and 38-42 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

13. In view of the paper filed on 27 August 2003, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection set forth.

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, and 31, on page 23, lines 12-26, and page 23, line 28 to page 24, line 9, and page 25, lines 7-14, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

15. Applicant's arguments filed August 23, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant(s) states on page 17, lines 7-21, that the examiner improperly went Final on the previous office action due to a new grounds of rejection to claim 10. In response, prosecution has been reopened, and the examiner has maintained the previous basis for the rejection of claim 10 as given above.

Applicant(s) argue on page 23, lines 1-9, that fails to disclose any teachings of intermediate devices performing the actions as previously claimed. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. The firewalls disclosed by Mendez et al. do in fact serve as intermediate servers that establish connection with other remote devices. In such a protected environment (e.g. a corporate network), the firewall *must* provide the outside connection to a remote device in the form of a proxy.

Applicant(s) argue on page 24, lines 10-25, that none of the references disclose obtaining information from the second server device about services available via the second server device. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. Bezair et al. does in fact disclose such a system that performs these actions, as cited above.

Applicant(s) argue on page 27, lines 13-20, that none of the references disclose an intermediate server maintaining a listing of the services available from a device to which it is connected and provides the list to the client device via the other intermediate server upon

request. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. Col. 12, lines 47-55 of Rossmann clearly indicates a listing of menu items that are associates with a resource locator that includes an address of the particular object associated with that menu item, thus providing a listing of services available from a connected device.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marlon Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 305-4642. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess, can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3230.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Marlon B. Johnson

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100